

TS-EAS - EAC-CPF team

Place: Virtual meeting, Zoom

Date: Friday, 8 January 2021, 7am Boston / 1pm Berlin / 11pm Melbourne

Notes: Wim

Minutes

1) <reference>

- see Topic: Reference
 - a) parent elements, p 2
 - b) @target, p 7

Discussion/decision on b) @target:

Mark: @target is for internal linking especially in EAD; I have no idea on how it will be used in EAC-CPF (was never in EAC-CPF before); I don't see a need to add it anywhere in EAC-CPF and if we are going to use it then we best align it with the use in EAD, so just in the reference element.

Kerstin: I agree with this, I think if it's going to be used with reference only then we would have to consider where to use reference in order to enable internal links between certain elements, because now the assumption is that we would only use reference with href.

Silke: the idea was to simplify schematron and to clean up the attributes for reference, so to use reference only for external linking and to use attributes including @target for internal linking and in addition to use @target for internal linking for all elements, if that's the case then we would not need @target to add to reference for internal linking.

Mark: but then reference would still get the @target attribute ... I can see a use case in EAD, but I can't see any use cases for @target in EAC-CPF.

Kerstin: this is a chicken-egg issue: there is no use case because we don't have @target in EAC-CPF yet; so there might be use cases; the real question is: do we want to apply the EAD model to EAC-CPF for this?

Gerhard: I agree with this: I don't see a use case for @target in EAC-CPF either, but there might be ones; so the question is whether we want to keep it.

Silke: Ok, but next question is where do we want to keep it?

Gerhard: anywhere or nowhere.

Kerstin: keep it means using it in another way ...

Wim: if we want to keep it, how are we going to describe it in the Tag library, because then we have to come up with a use case?

Silke: that's up to Ailie :-) ... I am in favour of going for the idea to introduce it for internal linking only.

Kerstin: there were no real comments on this when we asked for feedback previously.

Silke: so do we want to follow EAD for implementing @target in EAC-CPF?

Mark: would it be possible to use multiple ID ref's for @target?

Kerstin: what's the use case for this? are we going to do the same for the other reference attributes?

Mark: this might be an additional feature, but maybe we just have to keep it like it is.

Silke: I will put it on my list for the call for comments as a change we have, to see whether there are (different) opinions on this.

Silke: should we remove @target from the root element?

Karin: yes, please no unnecessary attributes in the root element.

Decision: Keep @target as a universal generic attribute to all elements except for the root element and we will update the description accordingly and ask the community in the call for comments for an opinion on this and for use cases.

Discussion/decision on a) Topic Reference doc

Silke: the question is where to add the reference element; the discussion of December lead to a proposal with four options (A, B, C and D on page 2 and 3 of the Topic Reference document);

Silke: we already decided to not go for option A, so now options B, C and D are on the table to be discussed/voted on; I go for option C and Mark agrees with me.

Kerstin: I agree to go for option C as well, but I am missing localTypeDeclaration in the list, and I would rather have reference added to event than to chronItem and chronItemSet, and if we go for that we might consider to have event as part of the mixed content elements, so also allowing span to that (this would make alignment with EAD easier).

Silke: after some discussion on the event/chronitem thingy Silke summed up: so the question is if we go with option C what might be a feasible way to implement this if we a) add reference to chronItem and chronItemSet next to place and event or if we b) add reference only to event as child of chronitem and chronItemSet, or c) can we do both? Maybe we can put this in a proposal to think about this any further?

Decision: Option C:

Add <reference> to elements with descriptive content and to elements containing the former element <citation>.

Elements with descriptive content or with <citation>: <abstract>, <chronItem>, <chronItemSet>, <conventionDeclaration>, <event>, <eventDescription>, <item>, <localTypeDeclaration>, <p>, <rightsDeclaration>, <source>

In this case an external reference would be available

- a. as mixed content: <abstract>, <eventDescription>, <item>, <p> and new <event>
- b. as own reference next to a descriptive note: <conventionDeclaration>, <localTypeDeclaration>, <rightsDeclaration>, <source>
- c. as addition to descriptive information, not having a <p> or descriptive note: <chronItem>, <chronItemSet>

Additional question on reference/target from Mark. Just confirming that “span” is still a valid child of “reference”, which it is.

2) Date attributes (Silke)

- data type for date attributes: alignment with EAD
- @notBefore, @notAfter, @standardDate have data type TOKEN in EAD, but union of the XML Schema Datatypes date, gYear, and gYearMonth in EAC-CPF

Silke: just want to confirm that we are going to follow EAD here (data type token in EAD)? → Yes (change it in all date attributes in EAC-CPF).

Karin: in favour of the other way around: adapt EAD to EAC-CPF usage.

Silke: Ok, so let's keep it as it is in EAC-CPF and ask for EAD to follow.

Kerstin: does it (the iso standard way of dealing with dates) support things like @certainty etc? otherwise we should make it more open ...

Silke: it's important to align the two standards as much as possible ...

Karin: still hesitating ...

Decision: We are going to follow EAD and write a schematron, so enforce validation, and follow progress in iso standards on this topic later on (EDTF).

3) Enforce element content for mandatory elements (Mark)

- see [Marks comment on #82](#)

Mark: for example: can recordId be empty? the question is do we allow that or not?

Silke: no specific opinion on this but can imagine recordId can't be empty.

Kerstin/Gerhard: actually at the moment having content in recordId is mandatory in EAC-CPF

Silke: Ok, so the question is how we are going to deal with this in the new version.

Gerhard: I am in favour of having content mandatory, at least for specific mandatory elements like recordId, if not all

Mark: I will discuss this with the schema team, as well as how restrictive this has to be (especially for recordId).

Kerstin: do we want to apply this also for other mandatory elements? → lists the ones

Mark: only a few ones, for example the ones that can contain a uri?

Gerhard: it's useful as an aid when creating xml files to be warned about having to put content in some (sub)elements you have to add as part of a (mandatory) element set; in that way you will know: either put content in or delete the whole element set.

Silke: we also have to take into account what kind of workflows are used to create xml files; for some workflows it might be convenient to be able to leave out content for mandatory elements

Silke: it should basically be a decision on a design principle for all EAS, so at a higher level in the TS-EAS

Kerstin: from a perspective of usage of the xml files (for example by an aggregator), having to put content in mandatory elements would be the preferred way to go.

Mark: then we should make it clear what kind of content is expected.

Decision: Let's keep it as it is (providing content only mandatory for some mandatory elements, like recordId) and bring this matter to the attention of the other TS-EAS community groups to come up with a definitive decision on this?

4) Enforce elements order in the Schema [#257](#) (Mark)

- see background document for information (mainly prepared for Schema team meeting on Tuesday, 12 January)

Silke: this is rather an issue for the schema team; @Mark let us know what the schema team decides and let's then assess whether that will have consequences for us and how we are going to deal with this (this can be dealt with via email) and it's not necessary to have this already dealt with before the call for comments.

5) <alternativeSet> [#154](#) (Mark)

Ailie: I will get in touch with some persons for more info on this once they get back from holidays.

Decision: We will wait for Ailie's reaction → Keep it in case Ailie can come up with a strong use case for this, otherwise we will delete it and put this in the call for comments.

6) Details

- confirm to remove @listType=deflist [#127](#) (Mark)
Decision: all are Ok with this
- confirm to add value "agent" to @targetType [#253](#) (Mark)
Decision: all are Ok with this

7) Where are we?

- status Tag Library (Ailie) - Any help needed? Anything missing?

Ailie: it's coming along fine; I already have a draft version; I don't really need to discuss issues right now, but I can use some help with proofreading, but I will definitely let you know (whether help is needed and when proofreading can start) next week.

- status Schema (Mark) - Any help needed? Anything missing?

Mark: I am still still is working in a development branch; I might need some extra help in a couple of weeks; there is a framework for the EAD schematron, but no timeline for finishing this yet is agreed upon yet.

Karin: the EAD schematron doesn't have to be ready before we publish the EAD call for comments.

Silke: so needed for the call for comments: the schema file, the rng file and the tag library.

Mark/Karin: conversion stylesheets can be made available afterwards (after the release), just like for EAD2002 and EAD3.

Silke: end of next week I will know what's needed for launching a call for comments and I will be able to establish a timeline; I think we're not going to release the call for comments before February, so we will be able to discuss this again in the beginning of February; @Ailie/Mark: please let us know in case you need help.

8) Any other business (all)

Silke: I need someone for proofreading when the text for the call for comments is ready → preferably some native English speaking person → Sara is Ok with this; will be needed at the beginning of February.

9) Next meeting

- Friday, 5 February 2021: 7am Boston / 1pm Berlin / 11pm Melbourne
- Friday, 5 March 2021: 7am Boston / 1pm Berlin / 11pm Melbourne
- Friday, 9 April 2021: 7am Boston / 1pm Berlin / 9pm Melbourne